



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

cult to understand the reasons for this curtailment of portions so important. A history of mankind, or even of primitive mankind, without reference to the Japanese, Chinese, Mongols, Turks, Dravidians or Hindoos, Indians, Arabs, Berbers, Hamitic or Semitic stocks and Europeans, certainly seems one-sided. To me it appears that the value of the entire work for the purposes of the general reader has thus been seriously affected. On the other hand, we note some enrichment of the material on South America, by the use of the recent works of Von den Steinen, Ehrenreich and others.

The English of the translator is rather peculiar and sometimes awkward. Such expressions as "enthraling insight," "stationariness," "a refinement of science which . . . will hardly hold water," "the most conspicuous thing in the Bushman is the smallness of him," *etc.*, are not uncommon. We note a typographical error on page 15, where "Dammann" is misspelled; on page 210 "mongolic" [Mongolian?] is wanting in a capital. Aside from a few slips like these, the bookmaker's work has been very creditably done.

WILLIAM Z. RIPLEY.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.

Aristocracy and Evolution: A Study of the Rights, the Origin and the Social Functions of the Wealthier Classes. By W. H. MALLOCK. London and New York, The Macmillan Co., 1898. — 385 pp.

The word aristocracy, the author explains in his preface, has no special reference to a "class distinguished by hereditary political privileges, by titles, or by heraldic pedigree." It means rather the "exceptionally gifted and efficient minority, no matter what the position in which its members may have been born, or what the sphere of social progress in which their exceptional efficiency shows itself." In developing this conception of aristocracy or "greatness," the author reaches some curious conclusions. He tells us that a great man, regarded as an agent of social progress, is merely one "who is superior to the majority in producing some given class of result." This result must, however, be something which he makes others do, not what he does in his own person. With greatness in this sense ethical considerations have nothing whatever to do; even intellect is not a necessary element; will is frequently of more importance. The sole test of greatness is that it must communicate itself to others so as to make them think or act more efficiently than they would

unaided. From this standpoint the greatest poets are ordinary men, for they cannot increase the efficiency of others; while the inventor of the most trifling machine, no matter how stupid or how mean his aspirations or how stunted his moral nature, is great, for the reason that he makes those engaged in the manufacture and use of his invention act as they would not otherwise have done.

Mallock's conception of the great man is to be distinguished from that of the "fittest" man in the Darwinian struggle for existence. He points out, in the first place, that the fittest man promotes progress only because by a physiological process he raises the average capacities of his successors; whereas the great man promotes progress because he is himself more capable than his contemporaries. Secondly, the fittest man shows his superiority in what he accomplishes for himself and those immediately dependent on him by surviving, while others, because of their inferiority, die or languish; whereas the great man fulfills his social function solely by influencing others and helping them to live and to live better. Thirdly, each process involves a struggle: the one is a struggle for existence and results in a survival of the fittest, whereas the other is a struggle within a small section of the community for the direction of the majority. Social progress is, then, the joint product of two movements: the one is the slow evolution of the Darwinian struggle; the other consists of the rapid changes brought about by the leadership of great men. This brings us to the fundamental proposition of the book, namely, that

progress of an appreciable kind, in any department of social activity and achievement, takes place only when, and in proportion as, some of the men who are working to produce such and such a result are more efficient in relation to that class of result than the majority; or conversely, if a community contained no man with capacities superior to those possessed by the greater number, progress in that community would be so slow as to be practically non-existent.

Mallock does not, however, carry his "great man theory" quite as far as Carlyle. While they agree in holding that the great man is the sole cause of progress, in the sense that no progress could have taken place without him, Carlyle ignores, as Mallock does not, the fact that, since ordinary men are the tools with which the exceptional man works, the result is conditioned, not only by his capacities, but by theirs. Still, even with this modification, Mallock's position is not perhaps wholly unassailable.

Taking an illustration from the domain of economics, he says that

the annual *per capita* production of wealth in the United Kingdom 100 years ago was about £14. It is now £35. According to the author, if the entire production 100 years ago be attributed to common or average labor, — although this, he declares, is an absurd concession, — “we shall gain some idea of what the utmost limits of the independent productivity of the ordinary man are.” That is to say, there has been no increase in the productive capacity of the ordinary class, and the difference between the £14 and the £35 represents nothing more than the increase in the productive capacity of the few. “The ordinary man’s talents, as a producer,” he goes on to say, “have not appreciably increased in the course of 2000 years, and have certainly not increased in the past three generations.”

But, if there has been practically no increase in the productive talents of the ordinary class during the past 100 years, not to speak of 2000 years, what reason is there, we may ask, for believing that the productive talents of the exceptional class have trebled in the same length of time? As a matter of fact, it is probable that the vast increase of productive energy that has taken place during the last 100 years is not due so much to an increase in the congenital endowment of the few as to a constantly accumulating stock of knowledge and experience, to which the few have no exclusive right and title. Each invention contains within itself the seed of something better, while each generation stands on the shoulders of its predecessor. It is, therefore, unjust to set down all the progress of the past century to the credit of the exceptional class. In fact, Mallock seems at times to have fallen into the very error against which he warns his readers — namely, that of regarding a class of people as perfectly homogeneous instead of as being made up of an infinite number of gradations. Now, it is not to be assumed that society is divided into two well-defined homogeneous classes, the exceptional and the ordinary, and that between the two there is all the difference between progress and stagnation. On the contrary, there is an insensible gradation from the most talented to the least talented. Probably progress would not cease until we reached some homogeneous “submerged tenth.” Hence, when the author says that “without the few there could be no more progress than a train of railway carriages could progress in the absence of the locomotive,” he must be understood in a relative, rather than an absolute, sense. This will not, however, invalidate the essential principle of his argument.

The application of the foregoing principles occupies a large portion of the book. While applicable to every form of social activity,

—intellectual, religious, military, political and economic,—the most frequent applications are made in the domain of economics, for the reason that the processes involved in the production and distribution of wealth, though far from being co-extensive with all social progress, are typical of it. Socialism, in particular, comes in for a very large share of attention ; and it is in the keen analysis and arraignment of its proposals that the author is at his best.

Mallock shows conclusively that, since social progress is solely — we should say largely — due to the few, a society or community must supply to its great men the means by which they may exercise their influence and destroy that of the less efficient. There are, however, but two ways in the domain of economics, as he points out, in which the great man can influence the action of others: the slave system and the wage system—the one securing obedience by coercion and the other by inducement. Moreover, these exceptional men would always have to be secured through some form of competition. Again, if men are to enter into this struggle for domination over the masses and develop their powers to the utmost, a community must offer positions, possessions, pleasures and other advantages, which its potentially great men will deem worth working for. Otherwise progress will be checked. But socialism has nothing to give except honor and the pleasures of excelling and of doing good. If these be inadequate to induce men to exercise their powers,—as Mallock has little difficulty in showing that they would be, human nature being what it is,—the whole ideal of socialism is doomed.

Mallock is no pessimist: on the contrary, he believes that the future will bring to the masses a greater command of the comforts and luxuries of life, together with a lightening of the labor necessary to procure them. All this, however, he predicts, will be attained, not by a development in the productive powers of the many, but solely by the talents and activity of an “exceptionally gifted and efficient minority,” who will direct the labor of the many to more and more advantage. But while the conditions of all may be bettered, they will never be even approximately equal.

The temperate yet positive tone and clear, lucid style of this volume cannot fail to please. It abounds with plain, practical illustrations ; and, while written so as to be easily within the grasp of the layman, it is at the same time well worth the attention of the scholar.

A. V. HIESTER,